REMARKS

Amendments to the Specification

The units for impact strength in the table were corrected. This is the correction of an obvious error to its obviously correct form. Additionally, support can be found, e.g., in paragraphs 23 and 74 of the specification.

Claim Rejection Under 35 USC § 112

The rejection is moot in view of the amendment to the form of the rejected claim. Additionally, a period is added at the end of claim 19.

The First Claim Rejection Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 11-18 are rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Fujimura.

Yamaguchi teaches a transparent polypropylene sheet having "rigidity" (see paragraphs 4, 6, 7, 19, 31, 55, etc.), with the goals of the application containing the avoidance of "rigid fall of the sheet" (see paragraph 5), and "improvement method of the rigidity of a transparent polypropylene sheet" (see paragraph 4).

Fujimura teaches a laminated sheet having two surface layers and between them an "inside layer." This sheet is taught to be a "soft sheet." See the abstract at least stating this twice. Throughout the document the sheet is characterized as an "elasticity sheet" at numerous locations (see paragraphs 1, 6, 64, 76, 77, 88, etc.).

The Office Action does not at all address why one of ordinary skill in the art would take a component of a "soft sheet" which is also characterized as an "elasticity sheet" and use it in a sheet whose characteristic is having "rigidity" and whose objective is to avoid "rigid fall." One of ordinary skill in the art would be dissuaded from combining the teachings of these references due to their contrary goals. One of ordinary skill in the art would not expect an improvement in rigidity of the Yamaguchi sheet by adding a component of a film that is characterized as a soft or elastic sheet.

The Office Action also mischaracterizes the teachings of Fujimura in that said reference does not teach a "**composition** [which] comprises a propylene polymer and ethylene-alpha-olefin copolymer produced using metallocene catalyst ..." (emphasis added). The laminated sheet's surface layer(s) are made of propylene –based polymer and the separate internal layer is made of an ethylene-apha olefin copolymer. No "composition" of these two

components is taught at all. Paragraph 81 cited by the Office Action clearly exemplifies the lamination of the film system having surface layers and an internal layer. No composition is disclosed that would support the allegation.

Moreover, discussed characteristics of this internal layer is its ability to provide "pliability" as cited, e.g., in paragraph 4, and it "adhesion property" cited in paragraphs 62 and 64, in the system for producing the laminate system, which is elastic or soft.

There is nothing provided in Fujimura to one of ordinary skill in the art about this internal layer material, ethylene-alpha-olefin copolymer, which would prompt said artisan to use this material in a composition useful for producing a "rigid" film.

Although not necessary to patentability since the combination of the above references is not tenable to render the claimed invention obvious, also note that the present invention yields significant unexpected advantages over the closest cited prior art, i.e., Yamaguchi. Table 1 in Yamaguchi provides three working examples and two comparative examples. In the working examples, the impact resistance at 5°C is between 2100 and 2200 J/m, and at –5°C it is between 1650 and 1700 J/m. Compare these to the results in table 2 of the present application where the impact strength at 5°C is 3940 or above (e.g., ≥5920) J/m, and at –5°C it is between 2070 and 7050 J/m. The conditions for testing were identical in both Yamaguchi and in the present application, i.e., test load of 30 kg and 1-inch head. See paragraph 80 in Yamaguchi and paragraph 111 on page 33 of the present application. The testing machine's manufacturer was different.

Furthermore, although not necessary, since metallocene-type ethylene copolymer is used, a unique effect that so-called gum-like material is not likely to be generated in producing the sheet can be obtained in the present invention, thereby easily achieving continuous molding. See, e.g., the discussion in the specification on pages

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Second Claim Rejection Under 35 USC § 103 and

The Claim Rejection Under 35 USC § 102/103

Claims 19-20 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Miller and were rejected as allegedly anticipated by or in the alternate unpatentable over Seelert.

As admitted by the Office Action, Tanaka and Seelert both are silent regarding many of the achieved characteristics achieved by the claimed invention of the present application. Neither Tanaka nor Seelert, for example, even mention impact resistance at all, and Seelert in

addition is also not concerned with transparency. Indeed, the main focus of Seelert is the production of a product having reduced tendency to white fracture without any regard to impact resistance or transparency. See, e.g., the abstract of Seelert. Likewise, the goals of Tanaka are divergent in that they include the achievement of a product having high flexibility, heat resistance, compression set, and excellent scratch resistance in addition to having transparency. See, e.g., the abstract of Tanaka. The focus on the above-discussed sets of characteristics teaches and suggests only to one of ordinary skill in the art the preparation of products that are, e.g., optimized, regarding said goal sets of characteristics, and not others.

Miller is a secondary reference that does not concern the composition of the present claims.

As the Examiner well knows, and as also discussed in the application, in order to improve both the transparency and the impact resistance of a product in this field, minute adjustments for selection of the composition to be used is required as well as attention to producing conditions. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to merely look at the broad disclosures of the cited references and achieve based on said disclosures the presently claimed products which have both improved transparency and the impact resistance at the same time. As such, the broad disclosures of the cited references taken together with their goal characteristics for the products to be achieved, in view of the considerations in this art discussed above, are inadequate to render the claimed invention unpatentable even in a case where some general overlap may occur.

Reconsideration is respectfully and courteously requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, VA 22201
Direct Dial: 703-812-5331
Facsimile: 703-243-6410
Attorney Docket No.:KINOS-0002

Date: April 22, 2009

K:\KINOS\2\Reply Apr 09.doc